



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/034,995 01/03/2002		Scott Abram Musman	82088-0001	1115	
75	7590 10/03/2005			EXAMINER	
Scott Musman 7800 Hayfield Rd			HIRL, JO	SEPH P	
Alexandria, VA 22315			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2129		

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary 10/034,995 MUSMAN, SCOTT ABRAM Examiner	}	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner Joseph P. Hirl Art Unit Joseph P. Hirl All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Joseph P. Hirl. (3) Scott Abram Musman. (2) Martin Sulsky. (4) Date of Interview: 29 September 2005. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference color Personal [copy given to: 1) paplicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Pes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: N/A. Identification of prior art discussed: Doulk. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Doulk. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SUMMARY YORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SINTERVIEW. See			
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) <u>Joseph P. Hirl.</u> (2) <u>Martin Sulsky.</u> (4) Date of Interview: <u>29 September 2005.</u> Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, prief description: Claim(s) discussed: <u>N/A.</u> Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Douik.</u> Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant printing vaddressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW See TORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See</u>	Interview Summary		
(1) Joseph P. Hirl. (2) Martin Sulsky. (4) Date of Interview: 29 September 2005. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If Yes, prief description: Claim(s) discussed: N/A. Identification of prior art discussed: Douik. Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW SUMMARY CORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See		Joseph P. Hirl	2129
Date of Interview: 29 September 2005. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ Claim(s) discussed: N/A. Identification of prior art discussed: Douik. Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) FHE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILINIG DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY? FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative,	PTO personnel):	
Date of Interview: 29 September 2005. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: MA. Identification of prior art discussed: Douik. Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY CORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	(1) <u>Joseph P. Hirl</u> .	(3)Scott Abram Musn	<u>nan</u> .
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: N/A. Identification of prior art discussed: Douik. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claim allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	(2) <u>Martin Sulsky</u> .	(4)	
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: N/A. Identification of prior art discussed: Douik. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW Summary FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	Date of Interview: 29 September 2005.		
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: N/A. Identification of prior art discussed: Douik. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicat		tative]
Identification of prior art discussed: Douik. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See		es e)⊠ No.	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided to the Examiner two missing pages of the specification (30 & 3 see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined. Applicant briefly addressed the invention and specific points of difference to the prior art of Douik. Examiner suggested to the applicant that such points should be explicitly manifested in the claim language and particularly in the independent claims. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	Claim(s) discussed: <u>N/A</u> .		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see attachment). Examiner reviewed with the applicant the conditions under which an application is examined.			

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

- A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:
- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Client Matter No.: 82088-0001

APPENDIX I

EXAMPLES OF PRIMITIVE RESPONSE FUNCTIONS			
Response Mechanism	Description		
:exec	Executes a shell command or script with the appropriate		
	arguments filled in.		
:mail	Mails a mail template using substituted arguments in the		
	mail template file to the appropriate user or		
	Administrator.		
:notify	Sends an on-line notification of the message template		
	with the arguments substituted for the appropriate user		
	or Administrator.		
:append-log	Using a format string as an argument we can make		
	entries in the specified system log file. The log entry can		
	possibly cause another case to fire.		
:kill-process	This will kill or stop the specified process.		
:disable-host	Blocks all traffic and access from a specified system that		
	is passed as an argument. This may or may not involve		
	controlling a router or firewall via the agent.		
:disable-service	Stops or tuns off a specific network service from a specific		
	host, user, or network domain. Examples of network		
	services include http, mail, ftp, etc.		
:disable-account	Allows disabling of a specified user or all user accounts.		
	It is possible to permanently disable the account (e.g.,		
	requiring manual intervention to reinstate it) or a		
•	temporary measure that can be automatically reinstated.		
:enable-account	Allows an account that has been temporarily disabled to		
	be reinstated or reactivated.		
EXAMPLES OF CBR	KNOWLEDGE SHARING RESPONSE FUNCTIONS		
Response Mechanism	Description		
:set-sysflag	Sets a flag in the CBR agent(s) of the appropriate name		
•	along with a data value obtained from the current		
	situation. A flag can either be set locally, or across a		
	group of collaborating CBR agents. Optional arguments		
	can assign a timeout to the flag. The flag will either		
	disappear at a specified time, or after certain duration of		
	time.		
:unset-sysflag	Unsets the named flag and makes it disappear		
:set-property	Allows the flag to also represent properties of key, value		
	pairings. Flags and flag-properties can be used to		
	represent information that can be shared between		
	multiple resources and multiple CBR agents.		
:unset-property	Removes the property from the flag data structure		

Client Matter No.: 82088-0001

:increment-flag	Uses a count field associated with the flag to keep track of
	arbitrary counts or frequencies of events. An Optional
İ	argument can automatically decrement the flag count
	after a certain amount of time.
:decrement-flag	Decrements the flag-count either locally, or across
	multiple CBR agents
EXAMPLES OF K	NOWLEDGE SHARING RESPONSE FUNCTIONS
Response Mechanism	Description
:activate-cb	Activates the agents that monitor the resource associated
	with the case base (e.g., turns on a log file monitor).
:deactivate-cb	Disables the agent that monitors the resource associated
,	with the case base. Because the agent is disabled, no
	additional events associated with that resource is
	processed by the system, and no automated responses are
	carried out.
:activate-case	Makes the named case active. An optional argument can
	specify a new timeout that specifies how long the case
	should remain active.
:deactivate-case	Makes the named case inactive, so that it will no longer
	perform any automated responses.
:add-template	Allows new additional cases to be added dynamically to
	the case base. The new case that is added uses values
	from the current situation to tailor the chosen template.